



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Wessely, *Prolegomena ad papyrorum Graecorum novam collectionem edendam*. Vienna, *Carl Gerold's Sohn*, 1883. 3m.

Wulfstan. Sammlung der ihm zugeschriebene Homilien, nebst Untersuchungen über ihre Echtheit, herausg. v. Arthur Napier. Erste Abtheilung. Text u. Varianten. Berlin, *Weidmann*. 7m.

Zorzi (Bertolome), *Der Troubadour*. Herausg. v. Emil Levy. Halle, *Max Niemeyer*, 1883. 2m. 40.

BRIEF MENTION.—The first number of the *Internationale Zeitschrift für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft* has appeared. It is a beautiful volume, sumptuous beyond the dreams of philologists of an earlier day, and is embellished with an engraving of the statue of Wilhelm von Humboldt.

The editor is Dr. F. TECHMER of the University of Leipzig. The contributors are A. F. POTT (Einleitung in die allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft, 1-68); F. TECHMER (Naturwissenschaftliche Analyse u. Synthese der hörbaren Sprache, 69-170, profusely illustrated; Transkription mittels der lateinischen Kursivschrift, 171-92); G. MALLERY (Sign Language, 193-210); FRIEDRICH MÜLLER (Sind die Lautgesetze Naturgesetze? 211-14); MAX MÜLLER (Zephyros u. Gähusha, 215-17); L. ADAM (De la catégorie du genre, 218-20); A. H. SAYCE (The person-endings of the Indo-European verb, 222-5); KARL BRUGMAN (Zur Frage nach den Verwandtschaftsverhältnissen der Idg. Sprachen, 226-56).

A detailed account of some of the more important articles may be expected in the next number of this Journal. Meantime it must suffice to call attention to this new enterprise, with its princely outset.—(Leipzig, F. A. Barth, 1884.)

In 1881, M. HENRI WEIL gave us a second edition of his *Harangues de Demosthène*. This has been followed by a second edition of the *Plaidoyers Politiques de Demosthène. Première série: Leptine—Midias—Ambassade—Couronne*. The critical work of this eminent scholar needs no characterisation. The commentary ought to be studied by editors as a pattern. Clear, compact, sensible, free from wearisome grammatical notes, and illustrations that do not illustrate, marked by rare command of the literature, and an equally rare generosity in acknowledging obligation, modelled, in short, by the hand of a master who does not need to call the attention of the reader from the text to admire the commentator. Here and there grammatical knots are cut too sharply, but after all it is delightful to have a Demosthenes in which we are not insulted by a long discussion of everyday constructions.—(Paris, Hachette et Cie.)

The first volume of Professor JEBB's long-expected Sophokles has appeared. It contains the *Oedipus Tyrannus* with an English prose translation facing the Greek text. Professor Jebb's delicate touch in all matters of style gives his work in Greek poetry an especial charm. The metres are presented according to J. H. H. Schmidt, with ample acknowledgment of the service rendered by Professor J. W. White, of Harvard, in making Schmidt's system accessible to the English reading public. It may be added here, as a matter of history, that as far back as 1872, six years before White's translation of Schmidt's *Leitfaden* appeared, Schmidt's system was employed and his schemes given in the Latin grammar of the editor of this Journal. Professor Jebb also gives copious extracts from Mr. Norman's enthusiastic book on the Harvard Greek play, and

this cordial recognition of the work that has been done for Sophokles on our side of the water will increase, if anything could, the warmth of welcome with which this edition of the Oedipus will be received by American scholars. A more detailed notice may be expected. Allusion has been made to the service rendered by Professor WHITE's translation of Schmidt. A new service, which will be appreciated by a still larger circle of scholars, is to be recognized in the editing of Hofmann's *Question of a Division of the Philosophical Faculty*, that memorable paper, which has done more to put the study of the classics, as an educational organon, on its true basis than any treatise of modern times. If the unthinking clamor that has been raised against the study of the classics has had the effect of bringing into fresh notice and introducing to wider circles this unanswerable argument of the Berlin faculty, it is well.—(Boston, Ginn, Heath & Co., 1883.)

The new edition of CAUER's *Delectus Inscriptionum Graecarum propter dialectum memorabilium* is twice as bulky as the first, containing, as it does, 470 numbers and 354 pp. Cauer's *Delectus* in its original form was found to be an important aid in the study of Greek dialects, and the increased material of the second edition will heighten its usefulness. For beginners, fewer inscriptions and more notes would have been desirable, and, indeed, the book postulates a teacher and seems to be intended as a syllabus for lectures rather than as a handbook for private study. For purpose of investigation one must have even more material, but for purposes of illustration and ready reference it will be welcome to all.—(Leipzig, S. Hirzel, 1883.)

Babrii Fabulae. Recensuit MICHAEL GITLBAUER. Vienna, Carl Gerold's Sohn, 1882. This is the edition of Babrius that Rutherford treated with such needless severity in his own edition. It is not necessary to reproduce Rutherford's strictures, especially as an examination of the Rutherford text will show that the merciless critic has followed Gitlbauer too often to make his onslaught on the Viennese scholar becoming. It will not do to say that a man knows no Greek because he does not know as much about certain points of Greek as, for instance, Mr. Rutherford, whose introduction to Phrynichos has been well received by German scholars, in spite of its rhetoric. To be sure, Mr. Rutherford concedes to Gitlbauer 'native acuteness,' and that is some consolation, a consolation that cannot be accorded to many people, as the world is constituted. Gitlbauer's edition has no exegesis; Rutherford disdains to go at length into grammatical and lexical questions in his notes, unless it suits him, and there is much useful work yet to be done in Babrius for the history of constructions. By the way, it is sometimes hard for a man, who has not attained to Rutherford's knowledge, to appreciate his difficulties. So, for instance, he confesses that he is completely at a loss as to XXIII 5 δυστυχῆς δ' ἐπαρᾶται | καὶ βοῦν προσάξειν εἰ φύγοι γε τὸν κλέπτην. 'In what sense can ἐπαρᾶται with a future infinitive be used?' he asks. The answer seems to be given by Eur. I. A. 57 sqq.: καὶ νιν εἰσῆλθεν τάδε | . . . μνηστῆρας . . . σπονδὰς καθεῖναι κἀπαράσασθαι τάδε, | ὅτου γυνὴ γένοιτο Τυνδαρίς κόρη, | τούτῳ συναμυνεῖν . . . κἀπιστρατεύσειν καὶ κατασκάψειν.

Die Quellen der Alexanderhistoriker, von ARTHUR FRÄNKEL. Of this elaborate work we can only sum up the chief results. The author declines to accept the theory which explains the coincidences of the various historians of Alex-

ander by the assumption of a common collective work on which all the historians drew for their information. According to FRÄNKEL, Curtius, Diodoros and Justin go back to Kleitarchos, not Kleitarchos pure and simple, but Kleitarchos more or less corrupted. Diodoros' Kleitarchos was not much spoiled by additions or misunderstandings, but the source of Diodoros was still further troubled by bad materials before it reached Trogus, and before it got to Curtius a number of little changes were made and large additions put in from good quarters, especially from Aristobulos. Arrian used chiefly Ptolemaios and Aristobulos, the latter more than the former. Besides these authors, Arrian made use of Eratosthenes, Nearchos, Megasthenes, Kleitarchos and Hieronymus, besides other historians. Plutarch, in his life of Alexander, consulted a large number of authors in the original. His principal sources are Kleitarchos, Aristobulos, Chares, Onesikritos, the letters of Alexander, the Ephemerides and Hermippos.

The coincidences between Curtius, Diodoros and Justin, on the one hand, and Arrian, on the other, are never perfect, there are always discrepancies, and the differences from Arrian are common to Curtius and Diodoros. This shows that Kleitarchos, the great source of Curtius and Diodoros, used the same authorities as Aristobulos, the great source of Arrian, and that the modifications are due to Kleitarchos and Aristobulos themselves. Another result which Dr. Fränkel has reached is the point to which Kallisthenes continued his work, which is fixed at 328. As to the credit of the various authors, the honesty of Curtius is vindicated against Kaerst. Arrian is honest in the use of his materials, and Diodoros' credit, already good, is not shaken. Trogus (Justin) is also an honorable man, and Plutarch, considering the multiplicity of his sources, which he worked over in his own way, has not been guilty of many derelictions.—(Breslau, J. M. Kern's Verlag, Max Müller, 1883.)

ERRATA VOL. IV.

p. 57, line 10 from bottom, for *ἡμιν* read *ἡμων*.

p. 88, line 20 from bottom, read 'So in Homer *εἰπέ τε μῦθον* = Attic *τάδ' εἶπεν*.'

p. 91, line 8 from top. This statement of Sturm's should not have passed unchallenged: *πρὸ τοῦ* occurs, instead of *πρίν* occurs earlier. Comp. Thuk. 3, 68, 1: *πρὸ τοῦ περιτεχίζεσθαι* with 3, 64, 1: *πρίν περιτεχίζεσθαι*.

p. 220, line 4 from bottom, for *trahe* read *trahere*.

p. 305, line 15 from top, for 'Phileus' read 'Philebus.'

p. 316, note, for "No. 35" read "No. 25."

A few misplaced accents have been noted. On page 373, line 8 from bottom, for *ἀγλαον* read *ἀγλαόν*; but American Hellenists will readily correct such errors for themselves.